



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/759,786

01/12/2001

Ralf Hofmann

P-4596

2858

24209

7590

09/26/2006

GUNNISON MCKAY & HODGSON, LLP
1900 GARDEN ROAD
SUITE 220
MONTEREY, CA 93940

EXAMINER

BATES, KEVIN T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/759,786

Applicant(s)

HOFMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin Bates

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 28-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 34 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 28-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 33 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on June 26, 2006.

Claims 9-23 have been cancelled.

Claims 24-27 have been withdrawn due to restriction.

Claims 1-8 and 28-29 have been amended.

Claims 30-34 are newly added.

Claims 1-8 and 28-34 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-23 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Muta (6286003).

Regarding claims 1 and 28, Muta teaches a method for presenting a runtime environment component service by a first computer system to a second computer system over a communication network (Column 8, lines 36 – 41), said method being performed by said first computer system and comprising:

Art Unit: 2155

generating a user interface infrastructure, on said first computer system, to receive graphic user interface events from a lightweight component on from said second computer system (Column 9, lines 40 – 48) and to send remote graphic user interface commands to said lightweight component on said second computer system (Column 9, lines 48 – 52); wherein said remote graphic user interface commands are used in generating a user interface on said second computer system for a user of said runtime environment component service on said first computer system (Column 9, lines 40 – 52);

wherein said generating comprises:

receiving a call to a create bean window method of a bean service object
executing on said first computer from a bean object of said lightweight component
executing on said second computer system; and

calling an initialize method by said bean service object to create a bean window
object on said first computer system (Column 8, lines 8 – 21); and

using said user interface infrastructure to initialize said runtime environment component service on said first computer system (Column 9, lines 40 – 52) wherein
said using comprises:

calling by said bean service object, a create instance method in an application
programming interface of a client factory object of said lightweight component;

initializing a remote frame window object in said lightweight component by said
client factory object executing on said second computer system (Column 8, lines 18 –
21); and

further, wherein said runtime environment component service sends graphic user interface commands to said user interface infrastructure on said first computer system said second computer system comprises a client device (Column 6, lines 61 – 66) and said first computer system comprises a server device (Column 7, line 58 – Column 8, line 6).

Regarding claim 2, Muta teaches receiving, by said bean window object in said user interface infrastructure, a remote input action event via said communication network, said remote input action event being generated in said second computer system by said lightweight component corresponding to said runtime environment component service on said first computer system (Column 9, lines 40 – 48).

Regarding claim 3, Muta teaches transmitting an input event said bean window object to an application in said runtime environment component service by said user interface infrastructure in response to said remote input action event (Column 9, lines 40 – 48).

Regarding claim 4, Muta teaches processing said input event by said application in said runtime environment component service (Column 9, lines 40 – 48).

Regarding claim 5, Muta teaches generating a graphic user interface command to said bean window object by said application in said runtime environment component service (Column 9, lines 40 – 52).

Regarding claim 6, Muta teaches transmitting a remote graphic user interface command from said bean window object to said remote frame window in said

Art Unit: 2155

lightweight component in response to said graphic user interface command (Column 11, lines 1 – 21).

Regarding claim 30, Muta teaches calling an initialize method, by said bean service object, to create a bean frame object on said first computer system

Regarding claim 31, Muta teaches receiving, by said bean frame object, a load document command from said bean object of said lightweight component (Column 9, lines 10 – 16).

Regarding claim 32, Muta teaches calling, by said bean frame object in response to said load document command, an initialize method to initialize a window for an application in said runtime environment component (Column 9, lines 18 – 21).

Regarding claims 7 and 29, Muta teaches a method for presenting a runtime environment component service by a first computer system to a second computer system over a communication network (Column 8, lines 36 – 41), said method being performed by said first computer system and comprising:

receiving a remote input action command, by a bean window object in a runtime environment component service on said first computer system, via said communication network, said remote input action command being generated in said second computer system by a remote frame window object in a lightweight component corresponding to said runtime environment component service on said first computer system (Column 9, lines 40 – 48);

transmitting a local input action command from said bean window object to an application in said runtime environment component service in response to said remote input action command (Column 9, lines 40 – 48);

processing said local input action command by said application in said runtime environment component service (Column 9, lines 48 – 52);

generating a local output command by said runtime environment component service to said bean window object on said first computer system; and

transmitting a remote output command from said bean window object to said remote frame window in said lightweight component in response to said local output command (Column 9, lines 48 – 52) wherein said remote output command is used in generating a user interface on said second computer system for a user of said runtime environment component service on said first computer system comprises a client device (Column 6, lines 61 – 66) and said first computer system comprises a server device (Column 7, line 58 – Column 8, line 6).

Regarding claim 8, Muta teaches that said application in said runtime environment component service is in an office application suite (Column 11, lines 1 – 21).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 33 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 34 allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The prior art of record does not teach or suggest neither singly nor in combination the features of a method of presenting a runtime environment on a first computer to operate a second computer over a network that includes initializing a lightweight bean service object on the first computer which receives remote graphic user interface commands, including remote input action events and load document commands using load URL methods.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 26, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, the applicant argues that the in the reference, Muta, the slave daemon (the second computer) responds to connection requests, not calls from a bean object of the lightweight component as seen in the claims. The examiner disagrees, as seen in Column 8, lines 8 – 21, the slave daemon initiates the lightweight java object on the master computer in response to a connection requests, but once that object and connection is setup the java object handles all calls to the slave daemon (Column 9, lines 26 – 35).

Regarding claim 7, the applicant argues that the reference, Muta, does not disclose a bean window object, a remote frame window, or an application and the interactions. The examiner disagrees, as seen in Column 8, lines 13 – 21 and Column 9, lines 26 – 43, Muta's system operates through the use of a Java application sent from the slave computer to the master computer, the Java programming language inherently uses object oriented programming and so it uses objects in the application running both on the master computer and slave computer, and as seen in the mapping these objects fulfill the limitations of the claim.

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent No. 6880126 issued to Bahrs, because it discloses a remote GUI that accesses a target to retrieve documents.

U. S. Patent No. 7020882 issued to Lewallen, because it discloses a system remote controlling a system through a GUI.

U. S. Patent No. 6717593 issued to Jennings, because it discloses a system for allowing a client through an interface to retrieve documents.

U. S. Patent No. 6323881 issued to Broulik, because it teaches a GUI server that allows HTML files to be requested.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KB

KB
September 15, 2006


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER